



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,362	04/06/2001	Stephen Gold	30014165 US	3922
22879	7590	07/28/2005	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				PATEL, HARESH N
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2154				

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/827,362	GOLD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 28-57 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 28-57 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 28-57 are presented for examination. Claims 1-27 are cancelled. Claims 28-57 are new.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 5/2/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 28-57 is maintained.

Applicant argues (1), "cited references, do not disclose the claimed subject matter of claims 28-35, 38, 41, 45". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The claimed subject matter of claims 28-35, 38, 41, 45, has been newly added, which is addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection (please refer to the below rejections of this office action). Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Response to Amendment

3. The amendment to the title and specification, dated 5/2/05, has been acknowledged.
4. The amendment filed 5/2/2005 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

Art Unit: 2154

- a. newly presented limitations, “the identifying and the test performing steps are performed only if all the headless computers of the group are capable of receiving the signal that a new account is to be added”, in claims 29 and 46,
- b. newly presented limitations, “the identifying and the test performing steps are performed only if all the new account is found not to be in any of the headless computers of the group”, in claims 30 and 47.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter, to avoid abandonment of this application, in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 29 - 45 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 29 - 44 mentions, “A method according to”, which should be “The method according to”.

Claim 45, line 3, “:” should be “;”, after “added to the client computer”.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 29, 30, 46, 47, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art to use and/or make the invention.

7. The specification does not contain subject matter to implement limitations, “the identifying and the test performing steps are performed only if all the headless computers of the group are capable of receiving the signal that a new account is to be added”, as cited in claim 29 and 46.

8. The specification does not contain subject matter to implement limitations, “the identifying and the test performing steps are performed only if all the new account is found not to be in any of the headless computers of the group”, as cited in claim 30 and 47.

Examiner has reviewed the specification (OCR whole document) and could not find support for the additional limitations as claimed.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 38 - 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 38 - 43 recite the limitations, “the particular headless computer”, “the particular headless computer entity”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Since, multiple “particular headless computer” (each particular headless computer) exist in the claim, it is not clear which “particular headless computer” is referred by the limitations in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 28 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dean et al., 6,182,131, IBM (Hereinafter Dean-IBM) in view of Sakakura, 6,785,819, Mitsubishi, (Hereinafter Sakakura-Mitsubishi) and Sanders, 5,734,831, Sun Microsystems, (Hereinafter Sanders-Sun).

12. As per claim 28, Dean-IBM clearly teaches a method (e.g., col., 1, lines 34 – 44) of adding a new user account (e.g., col., 2, lines 21 – 38) from a client computer onto a network including the client computer and a group of computers (e.g., col., 2, lines 5-19), the method comprising the steps of:

in response to the client computer signaling that a new user account is to be added (e.g., col., 2, lines 43 - 58), identifying the computers in the group that are valid targets capable of holding the new account (e.g., computers within sub-domain of LAN, col., 3, lines 13 –42); said identified computers are suitable to handle the new account (e.g., col., 3, lines 13 – 42);

one of said identified computers is suitable for holding the new account (e.g., col., 3, lines 14 –28), assigning the new account to said one computer for processing of the new account (e.g., col., 2, lines 34 – 42).

However, Dean-IBM does not specifically mention about performing a test(s) to check of the identified computers and in response of the test(s) indicating one of the identified computers to be suitable for processing the request.

Sakakura-Mitsubishi discloses the well-known concept of performing a test(s) to check of the identified computers (e.g., checking of subnet, col., 8, lines 32 – 58) and in response of the test(s) indicating one of the identified computers to be suitable for processing the request (e.g., reference of the computer of the subnet, col., 12, lines 12 – 54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dean-IBM with the teachings of Sakakura-Mitsubishi in order to facilitate performing a test(s) to check of the identified computers and in response of the test(s) indicating one of the identified computers to be suitable for processing the request because the test would provide information on whether the computers can handle the processing of the request. The information on which computer can handle the processing of the request would help handling of the client request.

Dean-IBM and Sakakura-Mitsubishi do not specifically mention about the computers being headless.

Sanders-Sun discloses the well-known concept of using headless computer (e.g., col., 3, lines 28 – 49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dean-IBM and Sakakura-Mitsubishi with the teachings of Sanders-Sun in order to facilitate usage of headless computer because the headless computer

would allow configuring from remote location and prevent local access at the computer. The prevention of local access would help secure handling of the information at the computer.

13. As per claim 45, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi and Sanders-Sun disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dean-IBM also discloses a network comprising (e.g., col., 1, lines 34 – 44) a client computer, a group of computers, the client and the group of computers (e.g., col., 2, lines 5-19) being arranged so that in response to a new user account is being added to the client computer (e.g., col., 2, lines 34 – 42).

14. Claims 29, 30, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi and Sanders-Sun in view of Kurowski et. al., U.S. Publication 20020019844, Entropia Inc (Hereinafter Kurowski-Entropia).

15. As per claims 29 and 46, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi and Sanders-Sun disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Sakakura-Mitsubishi and Sanders-Sun do not specifically mention about capability of receiving the signal.

Kurowski-Entropia discloses the identifying and the test performing steps are performed only if all the computers of the group are capable of receiving the signal (e.g. paragraphs 246 and 247).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi and Sanders-Sun with the teachings of Kurowski-Entropia in order to facilitate the identifying and the test performing steps are performed only if all the computers of the group are capable of receiving the signal

because the capability of receiving the signal by the computers would let the software know whether the computer would be used for creating a new account. The computer would help handle the processing for the client.

16. As per claims 30 and 47, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi and Sanders-Sun disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Sakakura-Mitsubishi and Sanders-Sun do not specifically mention about account not found in any of the computers.

Kurowski-Entropia discloses the identifying and the test processing steps are performed only if the new account is found not to be in any of the computers of the group (e.g. paragraphs 246 and 247).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi and Sanders-Sun with the teachings of Kurowski-Entropia in order to facilitate the identifying and the test processing steps are performed only if the new account is found not to be in any of the computers of the group because when the new account is not found in any of the computers would let the software know that the new account can be created. The computer handling the new account would help handle the processing for the client.

17. Claims 31, 32, 35, 44, 48, 49, 52, 54 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun and Kurowski-Entropia in view of Howes et al., 6,324,177, Cisco (Howes-Cisco).

18. As per claims 31 and 48, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun and Kurowski-Entropia disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun and Kurowski-Entropia do not specifically mention about comparing the address of the client computer with the address of the computers.

Howes-Cisco discloses the well-known concept of the client computer has an address and the computers that are the valid targets have addresses, and the test(s) include(s) comparing the address of the client computer with the address of the computers (e.g., comparing of part of IP addresses, paragraphs 3-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun and Kurowski-Entropia with the teachings of Howes-Cisco in order to facilitate the client computer has an address and the computers that are the valid targets have addresses and the test(s) include(s) comparing the address of the client computer with the address of the computers because the comparison of the addresses would help receive signal by the computers. The computer would help handle the processing for the client.

19. As per claims 32 and 49, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun and Kurowski-Entropia disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun and Kurowski-Entropia do not specifically mention about forming a set of computers consisting of the computers having the same address as the address of the client computer.

Howes-Cisco discloses the well-known concept of forming a set of computers consisting of the computers having the same address as the address of the client computer and selecting one of the computers from the set to be the computer to which the task is assigned for processing in response to the client computer address and the address(s) of the computers that are the valid targets being the same (e.g., using part of IP addresses of the computer devices, paragraphs 3-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun and Kurowski-Entropia with the teachings of Howes-Cisco in order to facilitate forming a set of computers consisting of the computers having the same address as the address of the client computer and selecting one of the computers from the set to be the computer to which the task is assigned for processing in response to the client computer address and the address(s) of the computers that are the valid targets being the same because the forming a set of computers consisting of the computers having the same address as the address of the client computer would help support the handling of requests of the client computer. The computer would help handle the processing for the client.

20. As per claims 35, 52 and 54, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun and Kurowski-Entropia disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun and Kurowski-Entropia do not specifically mention about forming a set of computers consisting of all the computers that are valid targets.

Howes-Cisco discloses the well-known concept of forming a set of computers consisting of all the computers that are valid targets and selecting one of the computers from the set to be

the computer to which the task is assigned for processing in response to the client computer address differing from the addresses of all the computers that are the valid targets (e.g., using part of IP addresses of the computer devices, paragraphs 3-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun and Kurowski-Entropia with the teachings of Howes-Cisco in order to facilitate forming a set of computers consisting of all the computers that are valid targets and selecting one of the computers from the set to be the computer to which the task is assigned for processing in response to the client computer address differing from the addresses of all the computers that are the valid targets because the forming a set of computers consisting of the computers that are valid targets and selection of the computer to which the task is assigned for processing would help support the handling of requests of the client computer. The computer would help handle the processing for the client.

21. As per claims 44 and 56, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun and Kurowski-Entropia disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sakakura-Mitsubishi also discloses setting up an agent on the computer assigned for processing of the new account and the agent handling the user account for the client computer (e.g., col., 3, lines 6 – 48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun, Kurowski-Entropia and Howes-Cisco in order to facilitate setting up an agent on the computer assigned for processing of the new account and the agent handling the user account for the client

computer because the agent would help receive signal from the client computer. The computer would help handle the processing for the client.

22. Claims 33, 34, 36 – 43, 50, 51, 53, 55 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun, Kurowski-Entropia and Howes-Cisco in view of “Official Notice”.

23. As per claims 33, 34, 36, 37 and 53, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun, Kurowski-Entropia and Howes-Cisco disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun, Kurowski-Entropia and Howes-Cisco do not specifically mention about the selection is to the computer of the set having the maximum amount of available file space and random to a computer of the set.

“Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing the selection is to the computer of the set having the maximum amount of available file space and random to a computer of the set is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the selection is to the computer of the set having the maximum amount of available file space and random to a computer of the set with the teachings of Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun, Kurowski-Entropia and Howes-Cisco in order to facilitate the selection is to the computer of the set having the maximum amount of available file space and random to a computer of the set because the computer having maximum amount of available file space would help support the new account. The computer selection based on random

selection would provide a computer that can support the processing of the new account. The computer would help handle the processing for the client.

24. As per claims 38 – 40 and 55, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun, Kurowski-Entropia and Howes-Cisco disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun, Kurowski-Entropia and Howes-Cisco do not specifically mention about for each particular computer of the group determining whether the particular computer has full data storage, determining whether the particular computer has reached a limit at which new users cannot be taken onto the particular computer and not identifying the particular computer entity as a valid target in response to either of the determining steps having a positive result.

“Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for each particular computer of the group determining whether the particular computer has full data storage, determining whether the particular computer has reached a limit at which new users cannot be taken onto the particular computer and not identifying the particular computer entity as a valid target in response to either of the determining steps having a positive result is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include for each particular computer of the group determining whether the particular computer has full data storage, determining whether the particular computer has reached a limit at which new users cannot be taken onto the particular computer and not identifying the particular computer entity as a valid target in response to either of the

determining steps having a positive result with the teachings of Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun, Kurowski-Entropia and Howes-Cisco in order to facilitate for each particular computer of the group determining whether the particular computer has full data storage, determining whether the particular computer has reached a limit at which new users cannot be taken onto the particular computer and not identifying the particular computer entity as a valid target in response to either of the determining steps having a positive result because the particular computer having enough data storage and/or which support additional new accounts would help support the new account. The response would help know whether the computer would help handle the processing for the client.

25. As per claims 41- 43, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun, Kurowski-Entropia and Howes-Cisco disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun, Kurowski-Entropia and Howes-Cisco do not specifically mention about for each particular computer of the group determining whether the particular computer has full data storage, determining whether the particular computer has reached a limit at which new users cannot be taken onto the particular computer and identifying the particular computer entity as a valid target in response to both of the determining steps having a negative result.

“Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for each particular computer of the group determining whether the particular computer has full data storage, determining whether the particular computer has reached a limit at which new users cannot be taken onto the particular computer and identifying the particular computer entity as a

valid target in response to both of the determining steps having a negative result is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include for each particular computer of the group determining whether the particular computer has full data storage, determining whether the particular computer has reached a limit at which new users cannot be taken onto the particular computer and not identifying the particular computer entity as a valid target in response to both of the determining steps having a negative result with the teachings of Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun, Kurowski-Entropia and Howes-Cisco in order to facilitate for each particular computer of the group determining whether the particular computer has full data storage, determining whether the particular computer has reached a limit at which new users cannot be taken onto the particular computer and identifying the particular computer entity as a valid target in response to both of the determining steps having a negative result because the particular computer having enough data storage and/or which support additional new accounts would help support the new account. The response would help know whether the computer would help handle the processing for the client.

26. As per claims 57, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun, Kurowski-Entropia and Howes-Cisco disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun, Kurowski-Entropia and Howes-Cisco do not specifically mention about the computers having one master and at least one slave coupled to the master and a management console coupled with the master for supplying commands to establish a master-

slave relation between the master and slave so that the master-slave relation is transparent to a user of the client computer during addition of a user account.

“Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing the computers having one master and at least one slave coupled to the master and a management console coupled with the master for supplying commands to establish a master-slave relation between the master and slave so that the master-slave relation is transparent to a user of the client computer during addition of a user account is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to the computers having one master and at least one slave coupled to the master and a management console coupled with the master for supplying commands to establish a master-slave relation between the master and slave so that the master-slave relation is transparent to a user of the client computer during addition of a user account with the teachings of Dean-IBM, Sakakura-Mitsubishi, Sanders-Sun, Kurowski-Entropia and Howes-Cisco in order to facilitate the computers having one master and at least one slave coupled to the master and a management console coupled with the master for supplying commands to establish a master-slave relation between the master and slave so that the master-slave relation is transparent to a user of the client computer during addition of a user account because the master would instruct the slave for supporting the client. The management console would support providing commands to the master. The transparent processing between the master and slave would help support the processing of the new account. The master and slave computers would help handle the processing for the client.

Conclusion

27. The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

July 23, 2005



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100